



CHICAGO JOURNALS

Transnational Feminist Crossings: On Neoliberalism and Radical Critique

Author(s): Chandra Talpade Mohanty

Source: *Signs*, Vol. 38, No. 4, Intersectionality: Theorizing Power, Empowering Theory (Summer 2013), pp. 967-991

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/669576>

Accessed: 28/08/2013 10:11

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Signs*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Transnational Feminist Crossings: On Neoliberalism and Radical Critique

What happens to feminist scholarship and theory in our neoliberal academic culture? Have global and domestic shifts in social movement activism and feminist scholarly projects depoliticized antiracist, women-of-color, and transnational feminist intellectual projects? By considering how my own work has traveled, and what has been lost (and found) in translation into various contexts, I offer some thoughts about the effects of neoliberal, national-security-driven geopolitical landscapes and postmodern intellectual framings of transnational, intersectional feminist theorizing and solidarity work. Specifically, I suggest that the way my work has been adapted and developed within a few marginalized feminist scholarly and activist communities offers valuable lessons for all of us who are university-based feminists. It highlights the limitations of postmodernist feminist knowledge projects in the neoliberal academy.

Over the years my work has focused on decolonization in general, but especially the decolonization of feminist scholarship and theory. I have argued against a scholarly view from above of marginalized communities of women in the global South and North, calling instead for attention to historical and cultural specificity in understanding their complex agency as situated subjects. Since the early 1990s my work has increasingly emphasized the need for systemic analyses, for an examination of broader patterns and structures of domination and exploitation. It is in the context of a call for systemic analyses that I have argued for the building of resistance and solidarities across borders. In an earlier essay (Mohanty 2003b), I responded to the misreading of my work as being against all forms of generalization. Here I address another, related issue—the brusque dismissal of systemic analysis of institutional processes as necessarily reductionist and totalizing (sometimes called modernist), together with the claim that systemic analysis cannot acknowledge the internal conflicts that compromise every system,

Many thanks to Satya Mohanty for lifelong conversations and sustained, critical feedback; to Jacqui Alexander and Zillah Eisenstein for thoughtful critique; and to Anya Stanger for fabulous research assistance. Thanks also to Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw, Leslie McCall, and Sumi Cho, the editors of this thematic issue on intersectionality, and to Beth Ribet, for valuable critique and feedback.

every operation of power. In what follows, I want to argue that this particular postmodernist position converges with the proliferation of depolitized multiplicities that is a hallmark of neoliberal intellectual landscapes. The danger is that the intellectual culture that is produced by this convergence in effect domesticates power differences, transforming systemic projects of resistance into commodified, private acts of rebellion.

During a recent solidarity visit to the occupied Palestinian territories as part of an Indigenous and Women of Color Solidarity Delegation, I confronted the limits and possibilities of feminist critique across borders (see Abdulhadi et al. 2011). Learning about colonial technologies of occupation, about the intricate gendered and racialized exercises of power by the Israeli state, I was more convinced than ever of the need for theory to address fundamental questions of systemic power and inequities and to develop feminist, antiracist analyses of neoliberalism, militarism, and heterosexism as nation-state-building projects. Yet, back in neoliberal “posteverything” US academic and political culture, I confront discursive shifts that mystify the conditions in Palestine. Postmodernism would suggest a fluidity (and mobility) of identities and subjects of liberation that obviate systemic critiques of oppression. Postfeminist and postracial discourse would imply that Israelis (and Palestinians?) have moved beyond discrimination on the basis of gender and race. Postintersectionality and some postcolonial, poststructural theoretical paradigms would suggest the irrelevance of analyzing the systematic interconnections of institutionalized processes of racism, (hetero)sexism, nationalism, and class exploitation in the colonial project of Israeli occupation. None of these “post” frameworks is useful in making sense of the landscape of violence, oppression, and incarceration that constitutes everyday life for Palestinians in the 1948 territories and in the occupied West Bank. An analysis of the gendered, racialized, capitalist colonial project of the Israeli state, ably supported by US economic and military aid, must remain at the heart of any Palestinian feminist struggle, and at the center of emancipatory knowledges and the theorizing of feminist solidarity.¹ This recognition of the limits (and dangers) of the “posts” in Palestine and the United States is key to the arguments of this essay.

Are we then left with a modernist (read: outmoded) feminist emancipatory project in Palestine? Minoo Moallem’s (2006) essay is an example of

¹ The “old” (and enduring) hierarchies of colonialism, racism, classism, and (hetero)sexism are alive and well in Palestine (as they are in the United States). Global processes of domination and subordination are certainly complex in 2013, but the technologies of colonialism are still accompanied by violence and exclusions that are systemic.

feminist critique that I find remarkably generative, representative of a postmodernist position that brings feminist critical-race, intersectionality theorists and antiracist, transnational feminist theorists under the same umbrella. Yet it is also deeply troubling. Moallem reviews several feminist texts, including *Global Critical Race Feminism* (Wing 2000) and *Feminism without Borders* (Mohanty 2003a). Moallem suggests that “a modernist feminist internationalist agenda” (2006, 345) is problematic for two reasons. It assumes an other—a unified subject that either has to be rescued or put in the center of analysis. And it assumes that the local and the global can be contained in a counternarrative of anticapitalism (or antiglobalization) rather than approached as nonsystemic ruptures and discontinuities.²

This critique suggests that methodologies that entail institutional and systemic analyses of power, anchored in the experiences of subordination and resistance of the most marginalized communities of women, can be (are?) essentialist and reductionist (that they are not postmodernist and hence are modernist).³ This particular postmodernist critique falls short in some very obvious ways. It cannot address the politics of colonialism and the struggle for national liberation and social and economic justice that constitute Palestinian feminist organizing and analysis at the present time. Claims concerning modernism and reductionism do not exhaust what can be said about struggles for emancipation and freedom from systematic colonial oppression. Clearly there is a plurality of antiracist, postcolonial, transnational feminist theorizing, and abundant feminist scholarship on the gendered limits and dangers of nationalism (not to be confused with national liberation), but postmodernist critique that is skeptical of a systematic analysis of institutionalized power and of decolonizing methodologies that center marginalized experience (women-of-color epistemology) in struggles for justice is seriously off the mark—as evidenced in the Palestinian context. After all, an explanatory account of the systemic nature of power does not entail inattentiveness to local contradictions or contexts of struggle. On the contrary, such a sociopolitical explanation enables recognition of those moments of

² There have been similar critiques of my work by a number of feminist scholars. See, especially, critiques by Rita Felski (1997), Linda Seidel (2005), Sunera Thobani (2005), and Kathryn Trevenen (2005).

³ Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw's work on intersectionality has been read similarly, with critics often reducing the institutional analysis of state power and women-of-color epistemology to essentialist and reductive formulations. On the other hand, Chao-Ju Chen (2007) draws on the systemic, institutional analysis in Crenshaw's work and my own to define the politics of difference in Asian feminism in terms of a differentiated universalism in the context of universal moral commitment.

rupture and possibility that counterhegemonic movements can use to build solidarities across borders.

The convergence of such critiques with the normalized neoliberal rationalities of the late twentieth and early twenty-first century bears examination. Is there a threshold of disappearance here—as Michel Foucault (1969) defines it—a point at which discursive formations are transformed? In an insightful analysis, Kelly Coogan-Gehr (2011) suggests that the emergence of the categories third-world women and women of color in the 1980s displaced and marginalized the scholarship of African American women, thus marking a threshold of disappearance in feminist scholarship.

I want to raise a similar question in this essay. Does postmodernism coupled with neoliberal knowledge economies in effect define a threshold of disappearance where one conceptual frame (systemic or intersectional) is quietly subsumed under and supplanted by another emerging frame, one that obscures crucial relations of power? In this essay, I explore a convergence between neoliberalism and postmodernism that depoliticizes radical theory (or insurgent knowledge as I prefer to call it). Coogan-Gehr’s analysis of the tensions between a politics of territoriality (location and identity) and a politics of mobility (Foucault’s notion of capillary politics) in US feminist scholarship on race is relevant to the discussion that follows.

Neoliberal landscapes and the depoliticization of antiracist feminist thought

Neoliberalism has transformed material and ideological conditions in ways that have profound implications for radical critique and insurgent knowledges. Neoliberalism in the early twenty-first century is marked by market-based governance practices on the one hand (the privatization, commodification, and proliferation of difference) and authoritarian, national-security-driven penal state practices on the other. Thus, while neoliberal states facilitate mobility and cosmopolitanism (travel across borders) for some economically privileged communities, it is at the expense of the criminalization and incarceration (the holding in place) of impoverished communities.⁴

The past decade has witnessed dramatic cuts in public funding for education and increasing privatization of higher education around the world (see Hanhardt et al. 2010; Ayers and Ayers 2011). Julia Sudbury and Margo

⁴ See Sampaio (2004), Davis and Mendieta (2005), Harvey (2005), and Sudbury (2005) for analyses of the links between neoliberalism, incarceration, criminalization, and new social movements.

Okazawa-Rey (2009) argue that radical knowledges are domesticated by the neoliberal restructuring of higher education. As I suggest above, neoliberal intellectual culture may well constitute a threshold of disappearance for feminist, antiracist thought anchored in the radical social movements of the twentieth century. Radical theory can in fact become a commodity to be consumed; no longer seen as a product of activist scholarship or connected to emancipatory knowledge, it can circulate as a sign of prestige in an elitist, neoliberal landscape.

To trace this threshold of disappearance of antiracist feminist thought, what is needed is an analysis of neoliberalism and the knowledge economy that not only provides a critique of corporate rationality and labor practices in university settings and in the operation of state and transnational governing institutions but also addresses the impact of neoliberalism on social movements. Neoliberal governmentalities discursively construct a public domain denuded of power and histories of oppression, where market rationalities redefine democracy and collective responsibility is collapsed into individual characteristics (Giroux 2003). Such normative understandings of the public domain, where only the personal and the individual are recognizable and the political is no longer a contested domain, are indeed at the heart of “post” (feminist/race) discourses. For instance, what happens to the key feminist construct of “the personal is political” when the political (the collective public domain of politics) is reduced to the personal? Questions of oppression and exploitation as collective, systematic processes and institutions of rule that are gendered and raced have difficulty being heard when neoliberal narratives disallow the salience of collective experience or redefine this experience as a commodity to be consumed. If all experience is merely individual, and the social is always collapsed into the personal, feminist critique and radical theory appear irrelevant—unless they confront these discursive shifts.

Neoliberal discursive landscapes in the academy, and in state and transnational governance practices, are characterized by the privatization of the social justice commitments of post-1960s radical social movements and their attendant insurgent knowledges (originally institutionalized in women’s and gender studies, race and ethnic studies, etc.). Privatizing commitments to race, class, and gender justice requires removing the social significance of racism, classism, or (hetero)sexism as institutionalized systems of power and inequality from the public domain, substituting individual prejudice and psychological dispositions or expressions of “hate” instead. This is a perfect example of a discursive shift, of a threshold of disappearance whereby critical feminist epistemological claims regarding experience, like “the personal is political,” are transformed into privatized notions of individual ex-

perience. Here, political agency itself is redefined as an act of consumption, and I would argue that theory—feminist and/or antiracist—is trafficked as a commodity disconnected from its activist moorings and social justice commitments (Giroux 2003).

The interwoven processes of privatization, consumption, and commodification of theory result in a politics of representation or a politics of presence disconnected from the power and political economy of rule. The epistemological and methodological claims of feminist and antiracist thought are transformed into a privatized politics of representation, disconnected from systematic critique and materialist histories of colonialism, capitalism, and heteropatriarchy (what Coogan-Gehr [2011] calls a politics of territoriality). This representational, discursive politics of gender, race, class, sexuality, and nation, disconnected from its materialist moorings, can thus be consumed more easily in institutional spaces. The complex political economy focus (highlighting power and hierarchy) of much feminist, antiracist theory, for instance, is either reduced to a politics of representation/presence/multiculturalism or seen as irrelevant in the context of a so-called postrace/postfeminist society. Thus, race and gender justice commitments, among others, are recoded as a politics of presence (or benign representation of various differences) in neoliberal universities.

Similarly, the appropriation of feminism in the expansion of the neoliberal project is also visible in the depoliticized notion of difference mobilized by neoliberal state regimes. Donna F. Murdock (2003) shows how the neoliberal state relies on feminist nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) for a theory of gender minus a feminist critique of power relations. This depoliticization of feminist theory is the basis for rhetorical commitments to gender justice that actively erase corresponding commitments to social transformation. Murdock argues persuasively that neoliberal states use gender-and-development discourse to underwrite a retrenchment from radical feminist politics—delegitimizing and domesticating such politics. The state is thus made “postfeminist” before feminists achieve gender justice!

The privatization and depoliticization of social justice commitments through representational politics in neoliberal landscapes requires a profound flattening of difference. Bronwyn Davies and Peter Bansal (2010) argue that neoliberal governmentality produces generic institutions and generic subjects while systematically dismantling the will to critique. Knowledge projects are detached from their local and historical moorings and reattached to the global market as “this place” becomes “every other place” and “this subject” becomes “every other subject” (Davies and Bansal 2010, 14). It is this flattening of difference in the neoliberal knowledge economy

that should be of interest to all of us. The transformation of gender and racial justice commitments into representational discourses and practices of diversity and multiculturalism in the US academy is a case in point. If feminist scholars are to preserve their commitments to gender, race, and sexual justice (the heart of radical, systemic, intersectional, antiracist feminist projects), they/we must attend closely to notions of diversity that embrace generic conceptions of difference that are flattened, privatized, and shorn of a critique of power.

Katharyne Mitchell (2003) explores the connections between state formation, economic organization, and educational systems in countries with large immigrant populations like the United Kingdom, the United States, and Canada by analyzing the shift from multiculturalism and ethical liberalism as key national narratives of unification in the period from the 1960s to the early 1980s to what she calls “strategic cosmopolitanism.” As the transnational, neoliberal landscape of global competitiveness restructured citizenship in the 1990s, strategic cosmopolitanism became associated with shrinking welfare states, privatization, and a culture of efficiency and accountability. The radical politics of difference and the social justice movements of the 1960s, 1970s, and early 1980s were domesticated as social contract management and individual patriotism eclipsed robust conceptions of the collective and the public good. When the market logic embedded within neoliberal governmentality infiltrates knowledge projects in the university and the will to critique is either absent or penalized, there are dire consequences for radical women of color and for transnational, antiracist feminist projects.⁵

Conservative scholars, media pundits, and popular magazines and newspapers began referring to a postfeminist and postrace society just as the project of the neoliberal restructuring of education gained traction around the globe. This shift in vocabulary from feminism to postfeminism and from race (and racism) to postrace (and postracism) in popular culture was meant to signify a movement beyond “old” forms of domination and inequality like racism, sexism, and (hetero)patriarchy. Thus, in a postrace, postfeminist universe, the very categories of gender and racial difference no longer signify social values, or power hierarchies—they are rather “market niches” (Giroux 2003, 209). Similarly, the move to transcend intersectional approaches in favor of a postintersectional stance is analogous to the post-

⁵ The Occupy Wall Street movement that began in 2011 is an important counterpoint to this neoliberal domestication of difference, naming as it does the 99 percent versus the 1 percent in terms of political and economic domination and marginalization. For a brief analysis, see Eisenstein and Mohanty (2011).

race, postfeminist move. Postmodern skepticism applied to intersectionality converts what originated as a compelling theory of the interwoven structures and inequities of power to an inert theory of identity that emphasizes difference over commonality, coalition, and contestation.

Feminist scholars have examined the ideological refashioning of racial justice as colorblindness and neoliberal racism, which result in the normalization of a market democracy and privatized notions of agency. Rachel Luft's (2009) analysis of the flattening of difference in discourses of colorblindness suggests that the social denial of prejudice is accompanied by a denial of the very history of the structural presence of race and racism in the US political landscape. Brenda R. Weber (2010) notes that the congruence of postfeminism and neoliberalism privileges entrepreneurial success and the ideology of individual agency as the solution to social ills, actively undercutting forms of political solidarity that are the basis for feminist and racial justice struggles. Weber argues that a postfeminist, neoliberal narrative normalizes the view that every woman is an island, that every woman provides for herself and has no need for tax-funded support or communal solidarities. The result is a privatization of difference, a depoliticization of hierarchy, and a narrow construal of agency incompatible with all collective forms of struggle for social justice.

In her cogent analysis of the legal academy, Margaret Thornton (2003) says that neoliberal rationalities accompanied by a managerial discourse of diversity (rather than the discordant realities of gender and racial injustice) have had a major impact on the sustainability of radical feminist and critical race projects in the academy. Similarly, Weber (2010) argues that postfeminism and neoliberalism share a logic of "ideological neutrality" (126), which leads to the rejection of feminism as a social project in favor of marketing one's identity as congruent with social norms.

To demonstrate how the privatization and management of difference in the context of postfeminist, postrace discourses influence the cross-border travel of radical feminist, antiracist projects, the next section of this essay reflects on how my own scholarship has traveled in three discrete geographical/national spaces—Sweden, Mexico, and Palestine. I focus on my own work here mainly because it points to some interesting cross-border dialogues, but such an analysis can also be performed for radical ideas from many other sources and contexts. This analysis of my work, and the extended dialogues with feminist scholar-activists at these sites, represents place-based struggles for gender justice and demonstrates how ideas are used or misused, developed, expanded, and enriched in relation to particular geopolitical contexts and communities.

Feminism across borders: Geopolitical translations

Undertaken to promote the objectives of gender, class, and racial justice, my scholarship and activism over the past three decades have been read and understood in multiple ways, varying with the material conditions and contexts of their reception.⁶ The uses and translations of my work as it is embodied in particular sites, communities, and feminist projects illustrates both the productive adaptations of decolonizing antiracist feminist thought and the pitfalls of the convergence of postmodernist feminism and neoliberal logics in the academy.

Two essays of mine, in particular, have crossed multiple borders: “Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses” (Mohanty 1986) and “‘Under Western Eyes’ Revisited: Feminist Solidarity through Anticapitalist Struggles” (Mohanty 2003b). Reflecting on place-based reception and critical framing of this work illuminates the traffic in theory—the politics (and commodification) of theoretical travel across social/cultural and national borders.

The transition from “Under Western Eyes” to “‘Under Western Eyes’ Revisited” marks my explicit engagement with the rise of neoliberalism and the normalization of corporate practices in the academy. The circulation of these works in various geopolitical locales reveals feminist complicity in imperial and capitalist/neoliberal projects and points to the limitations of knowledge-making projects in academia. It also signals the continued relevance of systemic analyses of decolonization and resistance in transnational feminist praxis. “Under Western Eyes” was written from my location as a part-time teacher in the US academy, as an immigrant “third-world” woman at an elite institution. Written fifteen years later, “‘Under Western Eyes’ Revisited” marked a shift in my own location to a full professor of women’s and gender studies in a less elite but still predominantly white liberal arts college. “Under Western Eyes” is an intervention explicitly addressing the colonizing gestures of feminist scholarship about women in the third world. It was written from within the context of a vibrant political and scholarly community of radical antiracist, transnational US women of color and a large and growing body of critical work by feminists from the global South. The essay was anchored in the experience of marginalization (and colonization) of the knowledges and intellectual agency of immigrant women of color in the United States. It was intended both as a critique of

⁶ For a sampling of critiques and responses to my work, see Marchand and Parpart (1995), Saliba (1995), Okin (1998), Clark (2002), Mendoza (2002), McLaughlin (2004), Ayotte and Husain (2005), Gupta (2006), Moallem (2006), Bradford (2007), and Mama (2009).

the universalizing and colonizing tendencies of feminist theorizing and as a methodological intervention arguing for historicizing and contextualizing feminist scholarship. “Under Western Eyes” had a clear political purpose and was written in collective solidarity with antiracist, cross-cultural feminist activist projects in the 1980s.

The publication journey of “Under Western Eyes” is instructive. It was first rejected by *Signs*. One external reader complained, “why did you waste my time on this essay? It says nothing of value!”⁷ The essay was subsequently published in 1986 (in an issue dated 1984) by the Left literary/cultural studies journal *boundary 2*. It was immediately picked up and reprinted by the British feminist journal *Feminist Review* and simultaneously translated and published in German and Dutch feminist journals. “Under Western Eyes” thus made its way into the US feminist academy via Europe. Since its publication in 1986, “Under Western Eyes” has been reprinted in numerous anthologies of feminist, postcolonial, area, development, and cultural studies, and translated into more than twenty Asian, Latin American, and Western and Eastern European languages. In the past twenty-five years, this essay has traveled widely across disciplinary, national, and linguistic borders. It is used as required reading in numerous disciplines from anthropology and international relations to literary and visual studies.

In contrast to “Under Western Eyes,” “‘Under Western Eyes’ Revisited” marks not only a shift in my own location in the US academy but also a different intellectual/political moment of knowledge production as neoliberalism transformed material conditions in higher education in the United States and elsewhere in the world. While my status as a professor of women’s and gender studies with access to some institutional power and an international audience was key to the way “‘Under Western Eyes’ Revisited” was received and the way it traveled across borders (this time *Signs* solicited the essay), the essay was also written as an intervention into cross-cultural feminist thought. It was written in part to respond to the ways that my previous work (including “Under Western Eyes,”) had been absorbed within a hegemonic intellectual culture of postmodernism, primarily by rewriting the materialist basis of the discursive analysis of power and the call for attentiveness to specificity, historicity, and difference among women in marginalized communities into what was described, oddly enough, as support for a theoretical and methodological

⁷ It is interesting to note that *Signs* reviewed “Under Western Eyes” during early to mid-1980s, a period described by Coogan-Gehr (2011) as representing an example of a “threshold of disappearance” (89) of the epistemological and methodological contributions of US Black feminists within feminist scholarship.

emphasis on “the local” and “the particular”—hence, against all forms of generalization. This particular misreading of my work ignored the materialist emphasis on a “common context of struggle” (Mohanty 2003b, 507) and undermined the possibility of solidarity across differences.⁸

As in earlier work, “‘Under Western Eyes’ Revisited” focuses on decolonizing feminism, a politics of difference and commonality, and specifying, historicizing, and connecting feminist struggles. The problematic reading of my earlier work meant that the material and historical continuities that were important to my argument in “Under Western Eyes” were lost in translation—as was the deep critique of Western feminist theory that called for a rethinking of how cross-cultural work is done in the context of racist and colonialist legacies. “‘Under Western Eyes’ Revisited” was written to address these losses and the depoliticization of my original project, as well as to model a form of feminist theorizing in the early twenty-first century—a feminist anticapitalist critique that constitutes a radical intervention in a neoliberal academic culture and corporate academy, advanced in conjunction with the rise of antiglobalization solidarity movements around the world.

While “Under Western Eyes” was written from a personal and institutional space of colonization and marginalization within Western feminism and the US academy, “‘Under Western Eyes’ Revisited” was written from the experience of struggling against neoliberal culture and postmodernist hegemony within the feminist theory establishment and women’s and gender studies departments. I consider both essays to be oppositional gestures in feminist knowledge production in the United States. In 2003, “‘Under Western Eyes’ Revisited” was also an insurgent knowledge practice that claimed anticapitalist and anti-imperialist feminist space in the center of the corporate academy and contested the neoliberal appropriation of gender, race/ethnicity, and sexuality as “disciplined” objects of study. I was not claiming a voice for “third-world women” in the academy, since that project was already underway in the larger antiracist feminist/women-of-color communities, and it was already being domesticated by a neoliberal intellectual culture.

My intentions as an author, however, cannot control how my works are read. The final section of this essay traces the way my work has been taken up in different sites as it travels across borders. “Under Western Eyes”

⁸ Scholars like Kevin Ayotte and Mary Husain (2005), Jyotsna Agnihotri Gupta (2006), and Chao-Ju Chen (2007), on the other hand, draw specifically on the connections between specificity and generalization, on the notions of solidarity across difference and the politics of accountability.

has resonated with readers who encounter the essay as immigrant, third-world women and women of color in academic and activist spaces where the narrow experiential politics of knowledge that “Under Western Eyes” critiques has significance. “‘Under Western Eyes’ Revisited” has been embraced by intellectuals, teachers, and activists in anticapitalist, antiglobalization, materialist feminist communities. Yet both essays have also been misread. In the context of the neoliberal, postmodern/poststructural capillary politics of mobility, both have been read too quickly as essentialist and reductive. In the end, however, these travels also expose the limits of the “posts” as knowledge-making projects.

Mapping place-based knowledges and the traffic in feminist thought

Arturo Escobar (2008) suggests that theories of difference travel between place-based meanings and enactments of Eurocentric/colonial globality. Discussing the geopolitics of knowledge, Escobar rightly says that “the dynamic of an imperial globality and its regime of coloniality” is “one of the most salient features of the modern colonial world system in the early twenty-first century” (Escobar 2008, 4). Brazilian feminist Claudia de Lima Costa (2006) frames the geopolitics of knowledge in terms of the uneven migration of analytical categories across borders, a process that causes some knowledge to be “lost in translation” as it travels to different hemispheres. Claiming that analytical categories have different rationalities depending on place, Costa looks at the traffic in theory by examining the ways that foundational feminist concepts like gender and women of color have traveled between US Latina and Latin American feminist spaces. Escobar and Costa both draw attention to North-South historical divides and to the colonial misappropriations and faulty translations of place-based theories of difference. Both suggest the need to reflect on the traffic in theory in a neoliberal landscape governed by global coloniality and Eurocentric globality. Writing about “traveling theories,” Richa Nagar (2002) raises questions about accountability and political commitments in the theoretical languages and frames mobilized by transnational feminist scholars.⁹

Drawing on these ideas about the relation of place-based knowledge practices and cross-border traffic in theory, I explore below the way my ideas are read, understood, and utilized in Sweden, Mexico, and Palestine. In each space, the work is available in English and in translation (Swedish, Spanish, and Arabic). Although my work has traveled to other sites, I have chosen to focus on these locations because I can draw on multiple levels

⁹ See also Alvarez (2000).

of engagement and collaboration with colleagues in these spaces. Thus, I can address questions of translation and travel of concepts as well as my own accountability to the ideas and communities I work with.¹⁰ At each site, I begin with a brief discussion of the impact of neoliberalism and global coloniality on the knowledge economy and gender justice commitments and then explore the way my work is utilized by feminist colleagues engaged in struggles for gender, class, and racial justice in their own local/global contexts. The discussion of my work as it is taken up by activist and academic feminists in these sites indicates why systemic analyses of decolonization are so important for feminist communities—across borders.

Sweden is an interesting instance of neoliberal gender entanglements. Sweden is touted as one of the most progressive countries in terms of gender equity policy, and Swedish gender discourse is an example of close links between the state and grassroots and academic feminists (Lykke 2004; Liinason 2006, 2010, 2011). Since the 1990s, women's and gender studies projects and the equal opportunity policies of the Swedish state have been quite closely linked. Mia Liinason argues that the concept of gender is reproduced to underwrite a progressive success story (gender equality) of the nation. Similarly, Nina Lykke, Christine Michel, and Maria Puig de la Bellacasa (2001) have argued that since the 1990s, European Union policies have provided political and economic legitimization of gender equality at the national level, thus weaving the institutionalization of women's and gender studies together with national gender equality projects. The impact of neoliberalism on women's and gender studies programs in Europe has entailed a shift from radical feminist critique to an emphasis on policy-oriented work that produces "equal opportunity experts" (115).

In recent decades the development of antiracist and postcolonial feminist thought in Sweden (de los Reyes, Mulinari, and Molina 2002; Mulinari and Räthzel 2007) has led to pathbreaking scholarship on the racial and class parameters of Swedish "gender equality." Diana Mulinari and her colleagues (2007) draw on constructs of intersectionality and postcolonial

¹⁰ I draw on scholarly texts as well as personal communication with feminist scholars in all three sites, posing a series of questions to a key feminist colleague in each site. These are colleagues located within intellectual/activist communities I hold myself accountable to, communities that in fact are a part of the transnational, antiracist, decolonizing feminist project within which I situate myself. Clearly responses from single individuals do not constitute systematic research, but they do provide an embodied and horizontal dialogue across borders that is an important site of knowledge. These exchanges also answer a crucial question that can only be asked and answered directly, that is, the struggles my work furthers in these three sites.

feminism to anchor studies in the field of postcolonial Nordic feminism. These studies investigate notions of Nordic whiteness, exploring immigration policies and the centrality of race and ethnicity to the public landscape. The Swedish feminist debate on intersectionality and postcolonial feminism is both vibrant and multidimensional. For this reason, I found it particularly interesting to look at how my work has been engaged and the struggles it seems to have made possible during a period when neoliberalism has gained purchase in the Swedish state, academia, and grassroots feminist movements.

Feminism without Borders was translated into Swedish in 2007. I can only track citations to the work in English (a major limitation, I admit), so I asked antiracist, postcolonial feminist scholar Diana Mulinari some direct questions about the impact of my work in Sweden.¹¹ Mulinari's assessment suggests that the constructs and theoretical/methodological aspects of my work, which have been utilized productively, include the critique of a Eurocentric and colonizing discourse of Western feminist theory, the significance of race and class intersectionality, the politics of location in the struggles of women in the global South and women of color in the United States (women-of-color epistemology), and the anticapitalist feminist analysis and notion of solidarity across borders. According to Mulinari, these themes have resonated in the academy, in art and cultural production, and in antiracist activism.¹²

Yet Mulinari also identified "misreadings" of my work that occur "through processes of appropriation . . . after acknowledging Mohanty in terms of a totemic symbol, (despite everything) 'the center,' (white) authors continue the doing of whiteness as usual, seldom analyzing the lack

¹¹ I asked similar questions to feminist colleagues in Mexico (R. Aída Hernández Castillo) and Palestine (Islah Jad): "Can you describe briefly how you think my work is read in Sweden/Mexico/Palestine? What constructs/formulations/ideas/theories are most useful? What interventions (if any) into hegemonic discourses does my work make possible? What limitations can you identify in terms of how my work gets translated into a Swedish/Mexican/Palestinian context? How is/can it be misread?"

¹² I believe it is worth quoting Mulinari at length since her voice represents a particular locus of struggle:

"Under Western Eyes" . . . is not only acknowledged as a pathbreaking intervention, it has functioned as a basis for the analysis of how Eurocentric representations of "other women" are at play in topics going from social policy to the media in Sweden and in Scandinavia. Nearly all the works that take a critical approach towards the category of "race" frame their analysis in the arguments developed in Mohanty's article. Important to underline is that the article has had an impact that goes beyond feminist academic circles. . . .

of women of color within the dynamics of knowledge production.”¹³ Mulinari’s astute observation sheds light on the impact of neoliberalism on antiracist feminist projects, illuminating the appropriation of my work through a citational politics (use of Mohanty as “a totemic symbol”), a rhetorical gesture disconnected from the systemic and materialist analysis of power. Thus, even as my work has had a significant impact in Swedish intellectual, cultural, and activist circles, Mulinari charts an “appropriation.” By “doing . . . whiteness as usual,” hegemonic feminist knowledge production traffics antiracist feminist scholarship across borders, domesticating women-of-color epistemology in ways that either erase or assimilate it into a Eurocentric feminist globality. This is a powerful example of a representational politics characteristic of neoliberal landscapes that manages to erase the fundamental theoretical and methodological challenge of decolonization, which is central to my work.

Feminist scholarship in Latin America reveals different aspects of the limits and possibilities of traveling theories. Claudia de Lima Costa’s work (2000, 2006) first introduced me to a discussion of what is “lost and found” in the translation of feminist theory across borders. Costa argues that the traffic in theory and the global export of feminist concepts across borders must be understood in terms of dominant and subordinate institutional configurations and historiographies across the North/South divide. Although Costa focuses specifically on US Latina and Latin American feminist translations, the theoretical points she makes about the potential untranslatability of certain concepts like women of color and the uneven migration of foundational concepts like gender are important considerations in understanding how my own work crosses geopolitical intel-

. . . Mohanty’s work has in different ways made it nearly impossible to discuss gender without engaging in an intersectional analysis of the different axes of power inscribed in gendered identities with special emphasis on the category of “race.” . . . *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism* puts the Global South in general and women in particular at the center of the doing of (feminist) theory and has broken new ground regarding the location and the position of Southern feminisms.

Feminism without Borders has had an impact not only among postcolonial, antiracist scholars but also on scholars exploring issues of social justice and solidarity. These new developments in her scholarship have strongly contributed to creating a bridge between postcolonial theory and labor studies and between critical development studies and ethnic/racial studies. Mohanty’s focus and emphasis on labor makes her work unique among postcolonial scholars, and this focus has been fruitful to introduce and to establish feminist postcolonial analysis in labor and organization studies. (E-mail exchange between Diana Mulinari and author, November 5, 2011)

¹³ Ibid.

lectual spaces. Costa's discussion of the way "gender" replaces "feminism" in the Brazilian academy is echoed in Liinason's (2010) analysis of how "gender" replaces "women" in the Swedish context. Both indicate the assimilation and domestication of feminism in neoliberal academic contexts. Focusing specifically on Ecuador and Brazil, Lynne Phillips and Sally Cole (2009) describe two disparate "translations" of feminism in the era of late neoliberalism, one from above and one from below (187). "UN-orbit" feminism is an approach toward gender equality embedded in systematic proposal-based global agendas (187). "Another-world" feminism is anchored in a decentralized, collaborative, diverse antiglobalization movement (187). Each of these accounts identifies contexts in which there are both faithful translations of insurgent knowledges and distorting appropriations.

In the Mexican context, scholars such as R. Aída Hernández Castillo (2002, 2010), Anna Sampaio (2004), and Michelle Téllez (2008) have deployed my work to foreground the agency of poor and indigenous women, drawing on notions of oppositional consciousness anchored in the lives of some of the most marginalized communities of women to suggest possibilities for feminist solidarity and alliance across borders.¹⁴ In addition, they have used the notion of discursive colonialism to critique hegemonic Mexican feminism from the epistemological space of indigenous women in Mexico. As Hernández Castillo notes, my work has been particularly useful in developing critiques of hegemonic urban feminism:

[Mohanty's] critique of the discursive colonialism of feminism has been applied to the strategies of hegemonic urban feminism towards indig-

¹⁴ Hernández Castillo writes regarding the impact of "Under Western Eyes" for indigenous women's resistance,

[Mohanty's] texts were translated and started to circulate broadly in a historical context in which indigenous autonomic demands for constitutional reforms opened a debate about how the recognition of collective rights and self-determination for indigenous peoples could endanger indigenous women's rights. In this context an important sector of the hegemonic feminist movement opposed the recognition of autonomous indigenous rights in the name of women's rights, using racist discourses against indigenous cultures and representing indigenous women only as victims of their patriarchal traditions. In this debate, indigenous women activists rejected the feminist representation of their cultures and denounced the colonial effect of these political and academic discourses. Some indigenous intellectuals started to use Chandra Mohanty's work to criticize the colonial effect that the victimization of indigenous women could have in their lives and struggles. At the same time the texts were used in several seminars organized by indigenous women in Guatemala, in which the subject of the decolonization of the Guatemalan academia was discussed. Important Maya intellectuals [such] as Aura Cumex, Emma Chirix, and Gladys

enous women.... The concept of discursive colonialism has been used to refer to the power effect that the [representation] of indigenous and Afro-Latina women [as victims] can have in the lives and struggles of these groups. Also the concept of transcultural feminist work and the politics of solidarity has been used to reflect about the need to create links and alliances between different women in this difficult historical moment of militarization (in the name of the anti-drug war) and criminalization of social movements.

Chandra Mohanty's theoretical-political work has contributed to the development of an indigenous women thought that is questioning ethnocentric visions of academic and political feminism in Mexico and its difficulty understanding evidence that subordination and gender inequality are not isolated, but intersect with ethnic exclusion, class, race and religion, etc. We could say that [her work] has de-centered hegemonic conceptions of gender contributing to the re-conceptualization of the concept of gender as a multidimensional category. Maya intellectuals from Guatemala in dialog with [Mohanty's] work are calling for recognition that there are multiple ways to articulate identities and gender projects within the constellation of actors and movements of a diverse and unequal Latin America.¹⁵

Hernández Castillo (rightly) suggests that an adequate critique of capitalism in the Latin American context must also engage a discussion of the globalization of the penal state. And she pinpoints particular contexts in which misreadings of my work occur: "Some urban Mexican feminists think that the first article generalizes 'white, urban feminism,' repeating the same mistakes that the article criticizes by homogenizing academic feminism."¹⁶ This critique of the homogenization of academic feminism is anchored in a familiar postmodernist argument where "differences within" always trump critical analyses of dominant discourses, leading to a refusal to identify the existence of a hegemonic feminism that has systematic effects on marginalized communities. Thus, the very aspects of my work that are useful to indigenous and Maya feminist intellectuals in identifying discursive colonialism in Mexican academic and political feminism and in calling for the self-representation of indigenous women are dismissed by a critique that refuses to acknowledge its own hegemonic will to power in the neoliberal

Tzul have used Mohanty's texts to write about discursive colonialism and the need for new strategies of self-representation. (E-mail exchange between R. Aída Hernández Castillo and author, November 18, 2011)

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid.

postmodern culture of Mexican feminism and the Latin American academy. Within privileged circles, my critique of the power of hegemonic feminism from the epistemological space of marginalized communities of women is misread as a representational politics focused primarily on differences within academic feminism. While those involved in the analysis of power and the systemic demystification of global capitalist and neocolonial processes from the epistemic location of poor and marginalized communities of women get me right, hegemonic versions of feminism, invested in privilege, tend to misread my work. These patterns are also evident in the Palestinian context, to which I turn now.

Neoliberalism is felt acutely in the context of the Palestinian women's movement. Given colonial occupation and the urgency of a national liberation struggle, many Palestinian feminist scholar-activists like Islah Jad (2007, 2009) and Eileen Kuttab (2008, 2010; see also Johnson and Kuttab 2001) call attention to the NGO-ization of the Palestinian women's movement post-Oslo. Since the first intifada, the impact of neoliberalism and colonial occupation have led to a dependency on donor-driven NGO funding, engendering a professionalization of social movements. Jad (2007) argues that this NGO-ization has led to the co-optation of grassroots social movements that posed a direct challenge to the occupation, opting instead for issue-based policy changes. Kuttab (2008, 2010) also explores the post-Oslo shaping of Palestinian feminism by neoliberal global frameworks, suggesting that since the 1990s, professionalized feminist NGOs have shifted the local focus from the intertwining of gender and national liberation to an international gender equity focus. According to Jad, it is in this context of depoliticization and professionalization of grassroots feminist struggles that my work entered the Palestinian intellectual/political feminist community:

Your work came to Palestine in a moment where the discourse of "peace negotiation as the only option" was starting to prevail after the first Palestinian popular uprising in 1987. Your work helped a great deal to deconstruct this hegemonic discourse that was working to marginalize what can be called "a home grown feminism" not driven by new liberal and universal discourse on women's rights. Your work was a cornerstone that helped us to defend our own notion of "militant feminism" that seeks to liberate the country and women in the same time.

I think it deconstructed once and for all the notion of "sisterhood is global." [Instead] you founded "sisterhood" on the basis of solidarity and resistance to empire and to global capital, [reversing a tendency

to see] contemporary feminism as “apolitical” and narrowly focused on “women” in isolation from their context.¹⁷

Unlike Mulinari and Hernández Castillo, Jad says categorically that my work “was not misread at all by us here; on the contrary it gave us a huge energy for reclaiming our ‘militant feminism’ and it helped a great deal to discredit the ‘peace negotiation’ camp that worked hard with donor funding to ‘bring Israeli and Palestinian women’ to build peace, assuming that feminism per se is capable to do wonders. Your work brought us back the spirit of resistance as the basis for solidarity.”¹⁸ Here again, Jad’s assessment of the impact of my work suggests that the migration of concepts like discursive colonization; anticapitalist, anti-imperialist feminism; and solidarity based on mutuality and accountability is most significant in the Palestinian context. Indeed, Jad concurs with Mulinari and Hernández Castillo that the most important contribution of my work lies in the decolonization of knowledge, the politics of differences and commonality, and historicizing and specifying women’s struggles and identities in the context of anticolonial, anticapitalist struggles within a neoliberal global culture.

Situating my work in the context of powerful divisions within transnational feminist praxis, Mulinari, Hernández Castillo, and Jad perceive my work as a critical intervention against hegemonic academic/political feminist formations. It creates a discursive space in which to decolonize feminist hegemonies by accoring epistemic privilege to the most marginalized communities of women. Thus, all three scholar-activists develop, in their own contexts, one of the central theoretical and methodological points of my work—the focus on a decolonization of feminist scholarship and theory and on women-of-color epistemology. Thus, this women-of-color epistemology inserts questions of racialization and the politics pertaining to racial/ethnic immigrant women into Nordic and Swedish feminist discourses, questions of indigenous women’s struggles and agency into Latin American feminist engagements, and questions of Palestinian feminist militancy and agency into discourses of peace and reconciliation in the Israeli/Palestinian feminist context.¹⁹ Each identifies systemic analyses of domination and resistance as key to radical feminist praxis—racism and anticapitalism/labor movements

¹⁷ E-mail exchange between Islah Jad and author, November 6, 2011.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ This is in contrast to Moallem’s (2006) critique of a modernist feminist internationalist agenda (under which my work is subsumed); there are no “others” to be rescued or centered in these articulations of my work.

(Sweden), colonialism and racism/indigenous agency (Mexico), and colonialism/militant indigenous feminism (Palestine). It is significant that the communities that find my work useful in all three spaces—immigrant, indigenous, women of color—are mirrored in the United States as well, once again emphasizing the significance of systematic analysis of colonization and resistance while signaling the limits of the “post.”²⁰

Yet it is precisely the power of decolonizing feminist thought, grounded in women-of-color epistemology and engaging in systemic analysis, that global coloniality seeks to suppress. I began this essay with a discussion of neoliberal intellectual landscapes and the privatization and depoliticization of gender and racial justice commitments through the domestication of feminist thought in state and transnational governance practices, in academic/institutional cultures, and in the transformation of social movements into donor-driven social contracts. One of the primary aspects of this discussion was the privatization of social divisions and the individualization of experience—the collapse of notions of collectivity into the personal and the transformation of power and political agency into acts of consumption.²¹

As this brief examination of divergent receptions of my work in hegemonic and counterhegemonic sites makes clear, there is a threshold of disappearance of intersectional, systemic antiracist feminist projects within these neoliberal intellectual landscapes. Indiscriminately extending an overly general postmodernist skepticism to all social and political theory would serve the neoliberal agenda very well.²² The neoliberal privatization and domestication of social justice commitments can go hand in hand with the postmodernist/poststructuralist dissolution of the systemic critiques of structures and institutions evident in intersectional, transnational materialist feminist engagements. This compromising of our politics reminds us that it is always important to turn the critique of privilege on ourselves. The dissolving of the systemic analyses of women of color and transnational feminist projects into purely discursive (representational) analyses of ruptures, fluidity, and discontinuities symptomatic of poststructural critique contributes to a threshold of disappearance of materialist antiracist feminist projects that target the state and other governing institutions. It is this

²⁰ See, especially, discussions of my work in Saliba (1995), Clark (2002), Ayotte and Husain (2005), Gupta (2006), and Mama (2009).

²¹ For useful discussions of postfeminism, neoliberalism, and the knowledge economy, see Larner (1995), Hall and Rodriguez (2003), Staunæs (2003), Braidotti (2005), Davies, Gottsche, and Bansal (2006), Genz (2006), Shope (2006), Choudry (2007), Feigenbaum (2007), McRobbie (2007), and McClenen (2008–9).

²² I have made similar critiques of postmodern skepticism elsewhere. See Alexander and Mohanty (1997, xvii–xviii; 2010) and Mohanty (2003b, 504–5; 2011).

danger of the appropriation of radical women of color and transnational feminist projects that should be of deep concern to us all.

The discussion of the travel and translation of my own work suggests the continuing importance of systemic analyses in radical antiracist feminist projects. It also points to the limits of knowledge projects in neoliberal academies. What would it mean to be attentive to the politics of activist feminist communities in different sites in the global South and North as they imagine and create cross-border feminist solidarities anchored in struggles on the ground? How would academic feminist projects be changed if we were accountable to activist/academic communities like the ones identified by Mulinari, Hernández Castillo, and Jad? I believe we need to return to the radical feminist politics of the contextual as both local and structural and to the collectivity that is being defined out of existence by privatization projects. I think we need to recommit to insurgent knowledges and the complex politics of antiracist, anti-imperialist feminisms.

*Department of Women's and Gender Studies
Syracuse University*

References

- Abdulhadi, Rabab, Ayoka Chenzira, Angela Y. Davis, Gina Dent, G. Melissa Garcia, Anna Romina Guevarra, Beverly Guy-Sheftall, Premilla Nadesan, Barbara Ransby, Chandra Talpade Mohanty, and Waziyatawin. 2011. "Palestine: A Call to Action from Indigenous and Women of Color Feminists." Report, Women Living Under Muslim Laws, London. <http://www.wluml.org/node/7422>.
- Alexander, M. Jacqui, and Chandra Talpade Mohanty. 1997. "Introduction: Genealogies, Legacies, Movements." In *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, and Democratic Futures*, xiii–xlvi. New York: Routledge.
- . 2010. "Cartographies of Knowledge and Power: Transnational Feminism as Radical Praxis." In *Critical Transnational Feminist Practice*, ed. Amanda Lock Swarr and Richa Nagar, 23–45. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Alvarez, Sonia E. 2000. "Translating the Global: Effects of Transnational Organizing on Local Feminist Discourses and Practices in Latin America." *Meridians* 1(1): 29–67.
- Ayers, William, and Rick Ayers, eds. 2011. "Education under Fire: The U.S. Corporate Attack on Teachers, Students, and Schools." Special issue, *Monthly Review* 63, no. 3.
- Ayotte, Kevin J., and Mary E. Husain. 2005. "Securing Afghan Women: Neocolonialism, Epistemic Violence, and the Rhetoric of the Veil." *NWSA Journal* 17(3):112–33.
- Bradford, Clare. 2007. "Representing Islam: Female Subjects in Suzanne Fisher Staples's Novels." *Children's Literature Association Quarterly* 42(1):47–62.

- Braidotti, Rosi. 2005. "A Critical Cartography of Feminist Post-postmodernism." *Australian Feminist Studies* 20(47):169–80.
- Chen, Chao-Ju. 2007. "The Difference That Differences Make: Asian Feminism and the Politics of Difference." *Asian Journal of Women's Studies* 13(3):7–36.
- Choudry, Aziz. 2007. "Transnational Activist Coalition Politics and the De/Colonization of Pedagogies of Mobilization: Learning from Anti-neoliberal Indigenous Movement Articulations." *International Education* 37(1):97–112, 133.
- Clark, Roger. 2002. "Why All the Counting? Feminist Social Science Research on Children's Literature." *Children's Literature in Education* 33(4):285–95.
- Coogan-Gehr, Kelly. 2011. "The Politics of Race in U.S. Feminist Scholarship: An Archeology." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 37(1):83–108.
- Costa, Claudia de Lima. 2000. "Being Here and Writing There: Gender and the Politics of Translation in a Brazilian Landscape." *Signs* 25(3):727–60.
- . 2006. "Lost (and Found?) in Translation: Feminisms in Hemispheric Dialogue." *Latino Studies*: 4(1–2):62–78.
- Davies, Bronwyn, Michael Gottsche, and Peter Bansel. 2006. "The Rise and Fall of the Neo-liberal University." *European Journal of Education* 41(2):305–19.
- Davies, Bronwyn, and Peter Bansel. 2010. "Governmentality and Academic Work: Shaping the Hearts and Minds of Academic Workers." *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* 26(3):85–98.
- Davis, Angela, and Eduardo Mendieta. 2005. *Abolition Democracy: Beyond Empire, Prisons, and Torture*. New York: Seven Stories.
- De los Reyes, Paulina, Irene Molina, and Diana Mulinari. 2002. *Maktens olika förklänader. Kön, Klass och etnicitet i det postkoloniala Sverige* [The various guises of power: Gender, class, and ethnicity in postcolonial Sweden]. Stockholm: Atlas.
- Eisenstein, Zillah, and Chandra Talpade Mohanty. 2011. "In Support of Occupy Wall Street." *Feminist Wire*, October 14. <http://thefeministwire.com/2011/10/in-support-of-occupy-wall-street/>.
- Escobar, Arturo. 2008. *Territories of Difference: Place, Movements, Life*, Redes. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Feigenbaum, Anna. 2007. "The Teachable Moment: Feminist Pedagogy and the Neo-liberal Classroom." *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies* 29(4): 337–49.
- Felski, Rita. 1997. "The Doxa of Difference." *Signs* 23(1):1–21.
- Foucault, Michel. 1969. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. New York: Routledge.
- Genz, Stéphanie. 2006. "Third Way/ve: The Politics of Postfeminism." *Feminist Theory* 7(3):333–53.
- Giroux, Henry. 2003. "Spectacles of Race and Pedagogies of Denial: Anti-Black Racist Pedagogy under the Reign of Neoliberalism." *Communication Education* 52(3/4):191–211.
- Gupta, Jyotsna Agnihotri. 2006. "Towards Transnational Feminisms: Some Reflections and Concerns in Relation to the Globalization of Reproductive Technologies." *European Journal of Women's Studies* 13(1):23–38.

- Hall, Elaine J., and Marnie Salupo Rodriguez. 2003. "The Myth of Postfeminism." *Gender and Society* 17(6):878–902.
- Hanhardt, Christina, Laura Gutierrez, Miranda Joseph, Adela C. Licona, and Sandra K. Soto. 2010. "Nativism, Normatively, and Neoliberalism in Arizona: Challenges Inside and Outside the Classroom." *Transformations* 21(2):123–48.
- Harvey, David. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hernández Castillo, R. Aída. 2002. "Indigenous Law and Identity Politics in Mexico: Indigenous Men's and Women's Struggles for a Multicultural Nation." *PoLAR* 25(1):90–109.
- . 2010. "Indigeneity as a Field of Power: Multiculturalism and Indigenous Identities in Political Struggle." In *The Sage Handbook of Identities*, ed. Margaret Wetherell and Chandra Talpade Mohanty, 379–451. London: Sage.
- Jad, Islah. 2007. "NGOs: Between Buzzwords and Social Movements." *Development in Practice* 17(4–5):622–29.
- . 2009. "The Politics of Group Weddings in Palestine: Political and Gender Tensions." *Journal of Middle East Women's Studies* 5(3):36–53.
- Johnson, Penny, and Eileen Kuttab. 2001. "Where Have All the Women (and Men) Gone? Reflections on Gender and the Second Palestinian Intifada." *Feminist Review*, no. 69, 21–43.
- Kuttab, Eileen. 2008. "Palestinian Women's Organizations: Global Cooption and Local Contradiction." *Cultural Dynamics* 20(2):99–117.
- . 2010. "Empowerment as Resistance: Conceptualizing Palestinian Women's Empowerment." *Development* 53(2):247–53.
- Larner, Wendy. 1995. "Theorizing Difference in Aotearoa/New Zealand." *Gender, Place and Culture*, no. 2, 177–90.
- Liinason, Mia. 2006. "Ph.D.'s, Women's/Gender Studies and Interdisciplinary." *NORA* 14(2):115–30.
- . 2010. "Institutionalized Knowledge: Notes on the Processes of Inclusion and Exclusion in Gender Studies in Sweden." *NORA* 18(1):38–47.
- . 2011. "Feminism and the Academy: Exploring the Politics of Institutionalization in Gender Studies in Sweden." PhD dissertation, Center for Gender Studies, Lund University.
- Luft, Rachel E. 2009. "Intersectionality and the Risk of Flattening Difference: Gender and Race Logics and the Strategic Use of Antiracist Singularity." In *The Intersectional Approach: Transforming the Academy Through Race, Class, and Gender*, ed. Michele Tracy Berger and Kathleen Guidroz, 100–117. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Lykke, Nina. 2004. "Between Particularism, Universalism and Transversalism: Reflections on the Politics of Location of European Feminist Research and Education." *NORA* 12(2):72–82.
- Lykke, Nina, Christine Michel, and Maria Puig de la Bellacasa. 2001. "Women's Studies: From Institutional Innovations to New Job Qualifications." Report, Advanced Thematic Network in Activities in Women's Studies in Europe, Uni-

- versity of Southern Denmark. http://let.uu.nl/womens_studies/athena/whole_document.pdf.
- Mama, Amina. 2009. "Rethinking African Universities: Gender and Transformation." *Scholar and Feminist Online* 7(2). http://sfonline.barnard.edu/africana/mama_01.htm.
- Marchand, Marianne, and Jane L. Parpart, eds. 1995. *Feminism/Postmodernism/Development*. London: Routledge.
- McClennen, Sophia A. 2008–9. "Neoliberalism and the Crisis of Intellectual Engagement." *Works and Days* 26 and 27(51/52 and 53/54):459–70.
- McLaughlin, Lisa. 2004. "Feminism and the Political Economy of Transnational Public Space." *Sociological Review* 52(1):157–75.
- McRobbie, Angela. 2007. "Top Girls? Young Women and the Post-feminist Sexual Contract." *Cultural Studies* 21(4–5):718–37.
- Mendoza, Breny. 2002. "Transnational Feminisms in Question." *Feminist Theory* 3(3):295–314.
- Mitchell, Katharyne. 2003. "Educating the National Citizen in Neoliberal Times: From the Multicultural Self to the Strategic Cosmopolitan." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 28(4):387–403.
- Moallem, Minoo. 2006. "Feminist Scholarship and the Internationalization of Women's Studies." *Feminist Studies* 32(2):332–51.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. 1986. "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses." *boundary 2* 12(3):333–58.
- . 2003a. *Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- . 2003b. "'Under Western Eyes' Revisited: Feminist Solidarity through Anticapitalist Struggles." *Signs* 28(2):499–535.
- . 2011. "Imperial Democracies, Militarised Zones, Feminist Engagements." *Economic and Political Weekly of India* 46(13):76–84.
- Mulinari, Diana, Suvi Keskinen, Sari Irni, and Salla Tuori. 2009. "Introduction: Postcolonialism and the Nordic Models of Welfare and Gender." In *Complying with Colonialism: Gender, Race and Ethnicity in the Nordic Region*, ed. Suvi Keskinen, Salla Tuori, Sari Irni, and Diana Mulinari, 1–16. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Mulinari, Diana, and Nora Räthzel. 2007. "Politicizing Biographies: The Forming of Transnational Subjectivities as Insiders Outside." *Feminist Review*, no. 86, 89–112.
- Murdock, Donna F. 2003. "Neoliberalism, Gender, and Development: Institution-alizing 'Post-feminism' in Medellin, Colombia." *Women's Studies Quarterly* 31 (3/4):129–53.
- Nagar, Richa. 2002. "Footloose Researchers, 'Traveling' Theories, and the Politics of Transnational Feminist Praxis." *Gender, Place and Culture* 9(2):179–86.
- Okin, Susan Moller. 1998. "Feminism, Women's Human Rights, and Cultural Dif-ferences." *Hypatia* 13(2):32–52.
- Phillips, Lynne, and Sally Cole. 2009. "Feminist Flows, Feminist Fault Lines: Women's Machineries and Women's Movements in Latin America." *Signs* 35(1):185–211.

- Saliba, Therese. 1995. "On the Bodies of Third World Women: Cultural Impurity, Prostitution, and Other Nervous Conditions." *College Literature* 22(1):131–46.
- Sampaio, Anna. 2004. "Transnational Feminisms in a New Global Matrix." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 6(2):181–206.
- Seidel, Linda. 2005. Review of *Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*, by Chandra Talpade Mohanty. *Feminist Teacher* 15(2): 163–64.
- Shope, Janet Hinson. 2006. "You Can't Cross a River without Getting Wet: A Feminist Standpoint on the Dilemmas of Cross-Cultural Research." *Qualitative Inquiry* 12(1):163–84.
- Staunæs, Dorthe. 2003. "Where Have All the Subjects Gone? Bringing Together the Concepts of Intersectionality and Subjectification." *NORA* 11(2):101–10.
- Sudbury, Julia. 2005, ed. *Global Lockdown: Race, Gender, and the Prison Industrial Complex*. New York: Routledge.
- Sudbury, Julia, and Margo Okazawa-Rey. 2009. "Introduction: Activist Scholarship and the Neoliberal University." In *Activist Scholarship: Antiracism, Feminism, and Social Change*, 1–16. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- Téllez, Michelle. 2008. "Community of Struggle: Gender, Violence, and Resistance on the U.S./Mexico Border." *Gender and Society* 22(5):545–67.
- Thobani, Sunera. 2005. "Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity (Review)." *Hypatia* 20(3):221–24.
- Thornton, Margaret. 2003. "Feeling Chilly (Again) in the Legal Academy." *Australian Feminist Law Journal*, no. 18, 145–51.
- Trevenen, Kathryn. 2005. "Stretching 'The Political': Governmentality, Political Society, and Solidarity across Borders." *Political Theory* 33(3):426–31.
- Weber, Brenda R. 2010. "Teaching Popular Culture through Gender Studies: Feminist Pedagogy in a Postfeminist and Neoliberal Academy?" *Feminist Teacher* 20(2): 124–38.
- Wing, Adrien Katherine, ed. 2000. *Global Critical Race Feminism: An International Reader*. New York: New York University Press.